1932

Department of L & Sett

OFFICE Bd of Rev

STATION madras

Proc No. 1789

1789

Dated 11.6.32

to 7353/31

To whom sent	Date	Initial
	Given for copying	
	Copied	DESPATCHED 14 JUN 1932
	Examin	
	Signed	14/6
	Given for despatch	
	Despatched	
	Indexed	
Pages in the file	To be destroyed on*	

(SUBJECT.)

Advances - Loans - (Bellary) - Harpanahalli taluk - Harpanahalli town - Muthiji Venkoba Rao - S. no 30 - Sale - Cancellation - Appeal - Rejected

* Not to be filled in in the case of permanent records.

F7355

Harpanahalli,
Bellary District,
Date. 12-12-1931.

To,

THE REVENUE BOARD,
MADRAS.

BOARD OF REVENUE
14 DEC 1931
LAND REVENUE AND SETTLEMENT

Sirs,

Subject - Appeal against Collector's orders D.Dis. C.3719/31-A-6 dated 10-9-31- Land Sales- Harpanahalli Taluk and town. S.No.30.

The humble appeal of Muthigi Venkoba Rao, Harpanahalli, beg to showeth by the following grounds that the land sales mentioned in the above reference is unjust and contrary to rules

1. That the sale was fixed and conducted on 20-3-31, a public holiday (Telugu New Year's day). which prevented many ryots to take part in the auction and hence the bid fetched was very low. Please vide sale notice No.4 attached.

2. That the sale was tom-tomed to be held at the Village Chavadi, but was conducted at " Veerabhadra Swami Temple", with an intention to benefit himself (Village Reddy) and ruin the appellant.

3. That the sale was finally bid by Mr. Bhagavanthappa an underling of the village Officer (much against Rule 45 Chapter 4 of the Village Officer's Manual). The fact that the said bidder is an underling of the Village Officer who is in inmical terms with the appellant can be ascertained by a perusal of his (I) Answer filed in Hospet Munsiff's Court. Case No.O.S.27/30. (II) His application to Revenue Divisional Officer, Hospet dated 15-4-31 and (III) his application to the Collector, Bellar dated 22-7-31. These can be got and verified.

4. That having granted suspension of Takavi collections last year, this sale was held for that year's dues ignoring the request of the appellant.

5. That the said land was under Civil Court attachment since 10-1-30 in O.S.No.27/30 of the Hospet Munsiff's Court. This fac was brought to the notice of the authorities in his applic dated 18-3-30, 14-1-31 and 13-2-31. The sale Officers hav

further failed to send notice to the said Civil Court in this case. This action is against Board Standing Order: Section No. 47 (II).

. That the amount in default being a trifling sum when compared to the income of the appellant, the officers have failed to proceed against the moveables in the House and against the standing crops before attaching the valuable land, as against Board's Proceedings Miscellaneous No. 1474/29-11-1920. -

7. That the amount shown in No.6 Notice and No. 5 Notice is different from that shown in No.7 Notice. This erroneous inclusion is against Board's Proceedings No. 32 (2) dated 5-5-23 Para 5. Please view notices attached.

8. That the final bidder having failed to deposit the bid amoun within one month after the date of sale, the sale itself may be seta aside.

he appellant begs to submit that he will on requisition submit any further references or certified copies relating thereto for verification.-

The appellant on the above grounds prays:-

(I) to get all the connected files from the Collector, Bellary and verify them,

(II) to set aside the sale,

and (III) to permit him to pa dues.

For which act of kindness the appellant begs to pray for your long life and prosperity.

The appellant begs to remain,

Sirs',

Your most obedient servant,

[illegible]

H a r a p a n a h a l l i .

ed 10th. January 1932.

RP 57
F297

To

The Office of the Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue and Settlement, Chepauk,
M a d r a s.

Respected sir,

Subject:- Appeal against Collector's orders - submitted.

Your Reference No. F- 7355/31-1/ 1 A.
dated 16-12-32.

On the receipt of your above reference, I have applied by registered post to the collector, Bellary for the grant of the authenticated copy of the order in question. Please vide Postal Receipt Np. 161 enclosed. Again on the receipt of your remainder I have once again reminded them to send me by registered post. Please vide the enclosed postal receipt. Even till to-day nothing as yet been received. I mean going there personally to get it and submit it to you. In the meanwhile, I fear, I may be late, and hence, I am submitting the original order itself for your consideration. In case, the grant is delayed, I request you to kindly consider the question on this original order or be kind enough to grant me more time so that the Collector office people may grant me the authenticated copy required.

For which act of kindness, I shall be highly grateful.

I beg to remain,
Respected sir,
your most obedient ryot,

Jois street,
Harapanahalli, Bellary Dt.

No. 1 [illegible]

For Insurance Notices see reverse.
Stamps affixed except in case of uninsured letters not exceeding 2½ olas or one ounce in weight or on which no acknowledgment is due.

Rs. As.

Date-stamp.

Received a registered * [illegible]

addressed to [illegible]

[illegible]

Initials of Receiving Officer.

* Write here "letter," "postcard," "packet" or "parcel" with the word "insured" before it when necessary.

If insured.

Insured for Rs. (in figures) _____ (in words) _____

Insurance fee Rs. [illegible] As. [illegible] (in words).

Weight — Rates — Tolas

Name and

NOTICE.—(1).—The Post Office is not liable for loss or damage in the case of Inland registered articles, unless they are also Insured.

(2).—The special conditions and restrictions as to Insurance which will be found in the current edition of the Post and Telegraph Guide, will be supplied upon application by every sender of an Insured postal article by the Indian Post Office Act 1898.

No. 1E

For Insurance Notices see reverse.

Stamps affixed except in case of uninsured letters not exceeding 2½ tolas or one ounce in weight or on which no acknowledgment is due.

Rs. As.

Date-stamp.

Received a registered *

addressed to

Initials of Receiving Officer.

* Write here "letter," "postcard," "packet," or "parcel" with the word "insured" before it when necessary.

If insured.

Insured for Rs. (in figures) (in words)

Insurance fee Rs. As. (in words):

Weight / Rates / Tolas

Name and address of sender.

NOTICE (1).—The Post Office is not responsible for loss or damage in the case of Inland registered articles, unless they are also insured.

(2).—The special conditions and restrictions as to Insurance which will be found in the current edition of the Post and Telegraph Guide are binding upon every sender of an Insured postal article by virtue of rules prescribed under the Indian Post Office Act, 1898.



13

To

J. Varadarajan Athalı
20.1.32

R.P. 15
dt. 08-
enc
FB

The Office of the Board of Revenue,
Secretariat & Settlement, Chepauk,
Madras

73

Sir,

Your Cord No. F. 7355/31-32 dt 19.1.32 4

As per your instructions, I have this day enclosed a Court fee label of the value of annas eight for favour of affixing to the order in question.

Trusting the favour of early [illegible]

en one manner.

I beg to remain
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
[illegible]

NB:- Sir, before despatching this, the authenticated copy from the Collector's Office was received. Hence it too has been enclosed.

[illegible]

Collr ca 2/32 15



D. Dis No. 3719/31

Proceedings of the Collector of Bellary

Dated 10-9-1931

Land Sales - Harpanahalli Taluk & Town.
S.No. 30 - Sale for arrears of State loans -
Appeal petition of Dwarkoji Venkoba Rao
against the order confirming the sale by
the Revenue Divisional Officer - Orders passed -
Reference: Board of Revenue Revenue Divisional Officers
Lr. Dis C no 3425/31 C. dated 1.9.31.

Order.

The first sale of the land held on
18.3.30 was cancelled, and a resale
held on 20.3.1931, a year after the
original sale. The appellant had ample
time to pay. His objection that the sale
was not held at the Village chavadi as
announced by beat of tom-tom when
in fact, was not so announced, is false.

The

3271

23-12-31

L. Raghavendra Rao

H. Sathish.

K. Bindu Rao

Kandoi

H. Sathish.



The appeal is hereby dismissed.

Sd/ A. M. de Gallebbi

10.9.31 Collector

(True Copy)

Sd/-

True Copy: Dy/s Collector

SK 8/1/32

3220

23-12-31

L. Raghavendra Rao
H Health.
K Bindu Rao
Vaidya
H Health.

Copied by S. Kesavulu Naidu

Compared by Rajahetti 11/1/32

No. of words 121

No. of Copies nil

Date of receipt 7.1.32

When copy ready 10.1.32

Date of despatch 25.1.32

-Idaripanahalli 4783

7 J

No 7355/31-1 do. The Office of the Board of Revenue 14
Madras

BOARD OF REVENUE
8 FEB 1932
LAND REVENUE AND SETTLEMENT

Subject :- Appeal preferred against Collector's orders - Sale Kavi land sales.

I, Muthiyi Venkoba Rai beg to submit that I have already sent one Stamped Copy of the Collector's Order. In Case any other record is to be produced, I request I may Kindly be intimated so that I Can submit them without any further delay.

As asked may be filed with the connected papers. → put up in a file on circulation

I beg to remain, Sir, Your obedient Servant

To the Secretary

Appellant

Addl. stamps & records have been called for from the pet.

1.2.32
KG
11.2.32

12.2.32

BOARD OF REVENUE
3 - MAR 1932
LAND REVENUE AND SETTLEMENT

RP. 173
T 1295
cb. 2-4- [illegible]

The Board of Revenue.
Land Revenue and Settlement
Chepauk.
Madras.

Respected Sir,

With reference to your F. No. T355/31-3 dated 8-2-1932, I am herewith submitting (1) Authenticated and duly stamped of copy of the Revenue Divisional officer (2) The Court fee label of the value of Rs —/ to be affixed to my petition dated 12-12-1931. I have also applied for Copies of records to the district Munsiff Court, Hospet, referred to as exhibits in my appeal petition. As soon as they are received, I shall submit them, if called for

I beg to remain,
Respected Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.
[signature]

Harpanahalli,
Bellary dt.
Dated. 1-3-1932

Encl
Authenticated and duly Stamped Copy of the Revenue Divisional officer.
Court fee label for Rs. 2/-

Post card. Ref. 11 dt 10-4-32 & 8-3-32
Petr calling for C.f. label for 8 annas
he afforded to the R D O
1-3-1932
[illegible]



2447/31. Proceedings of the Revenue Divisional Officer Hosur

Land sales Harapanahally Taluk of Town Sale of S. no 30.

Petitioner Muthiga Venkatalow

Order:-

The petition is rejected

13.6.31.

Signed P. Venkata Rayan
Revenue Divisional Officer

To the Treasury

Copied by R. Rangaiah
Compared by [illegible]
Counsel 2/7/32
Issued 35

[illegible]
23.2.32

Application received on 22 for } on 18.2.32
Stamp for [illegible] " Nil
Stamp for [illegible] " Nil
Copy ready " 23.2.32
Copy delivered or sent by } " 26.2.32

F 179 fr

of Revenue

Settlement,

Chehauk Madra

Sir,

In obedien to your (Ref No. F.73
31-4-1-A. dt 2.3.32 I beg to submit as follows

court fee labels for the value of
Eight annas has been enclosed to be affixed t
the Copy of the Tuvanal Officials order.

I have also applied for Copies
of Certain records from the Taluk Office, and
the Munsiff's Court and as soon as they are
received they too will be submitted to you
for Consideration along with the file.

I beg to remain,

Sir

Your most obedient Servant.

COURT FEE INDIA ONE ANNA
INDIA COURT FEE TWO ANNAS INDIA
REVENUE 30 MAR
INDIA COURT FEE INDIA

FOR MEMBER.

Addresses — Joint (Bellary) — Harpana-
halli taluk — Harpanahalli — on
Muttuni Venkobha Rao — case —
Cancellation — Appeal :

Mr A.

READ AGAIN B. P. No. _____ dated _____ 193

" " " _____ " _____ 193

READ ALSO :-- Mr 1-3 cf.

Register No. _____, From the H. [illegible], No. _____, dated _____ 193

" " _____, 35 cf. H 297 } B, _____, _____, " _____ 193
p 15 " H 644 }
p 19 cf. H 283 }
p 21 cf. 1295 }
" _____, p 23 cf. 1296 } " " _____, " _____ 193

RESOLUTION. Ref. No. 1500 dated 4-4-1932

Forwarded to the Coll. of Bellary for submn of the connected records with remarks on any allegations in the petition which are not clearly dealt with in the records.

Chn 2.4.32

4/4/32

Chn/3.4.32.

DE[illegible] 28/4/32

Issued 4/4/32

the Coll. of Bellary with a petition and enclosures in Orig. to be returned.

— pp 1-27 cf.

C.F. 32.

In reply, please quote number, date and short title.*

Revenue DEPARTMENT

Received

Registered

From (Name) A.M.A.C. Galletti Esq., M.A. I.C.S.,

(Designation) Collector of Bellary.

Post Box ....., (Station) Bellary.

Telegraphic Address .....

To The Secretary to the Commissioners,

Land Revenue & Settlement, Madras.

C. No. 1874/32 A6, dated 30th May 1932.

Sir,

ENCLOSURES

Records (Sent by Regd post)

SPARE COPIES

• Subject:- Advances-Loans (Bellary) Harapanahalli Taluk-Harapanahalli Town-Muthigi Venkoba Rao - Land sale-cancellation-appeal.

Ref:- Board's Ref.F. 7355-31-1 dated 4th April 1932.

I submit the records with the Sub-Collector's remarks.

2. The following are the records enclosed.

1. TalukD.Dis. 2315 dated 28-12-31. — (G)
2. Sub Collector's L.Dis.3425 dated 1-9-31. (I)
3. Sub Collector's L.Dis.1845 dated 28-5-31. (J)
4. Sub Collector's L.Dis.2294 dated 2-9-30. (L)
5. Collector's D.Dis.3719 dated 10-9-31 (H)
6. Tahsildar's report C.No. 620 dated 4-5-32.
7. Appeal petition with all its enclosures.
8. Copy of Sub.Collector's remarks.

A.S.N./30-5.

For Collector

91

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

In reply, please quote number, date and short title.*

Received _____ *Registered* _____

From (Name) M.Karamatullah Esq., I.C.S.,

(Designation) Sub Collector,

Post Box _____, (Station) _____ Hospet.

Telegraphic Address _____

To The Collector of

L.Dis.C. N.1982/32C., *dated* 17.5.1932. 19

Advances - Loans - Harpanahally Taluk- and town - S.No.30 - sale - cancellation - Vencoba Rao.M. - Appeal.

Ref. Your N.Ref.C.1874/32 dated 10.4.32.

Enclosures _____

_____

_____

Spare Copies _____

There is nothing in the Revenue Recovery Act II of 186 or in Board Standing Order prohibiting the conduction of sa on holidays (Sundays are of course excluded). The day - fixed for sale in thiscase was one (New year day) when all people in the village would generally be present in the village. It was in fact the most convenient date. The very fact that there were 50 persons present at the time of auction is in itself proof that the date fixed was in no wa detremental to the interests of the appellant. The resale held on 20.3.31 fetched Rs.355/- as against Rs.210/- realis in the original sale held on 18.3.1930, it was with considerable difficulty this bid was secured by the Revenue Inspec in these times of economic depression and tightness in the money market and particularly when land values had consider- ably fallen. The petitioner's prayer that the bid fetched is too low cannot therefore be accepted. Besides this a land sale cannot be cancelled for the mere reason that bid appears low unless there are other material irregularit to warrent its cancellation or if there are bona fide higher bid. All things considered, the appellant has no cause for grievance. Sale notice No.1 said to have been attache has not been received.

2. It was never tom-tomed that the sale would be held in village chavadi. Land sales are held in this town near the motor stand very close to the Taluk Office and which lies just behind the Sub Registrar's office as it is best fitted for this purpose being easily accessible to the public. The Revenue Inspector clearly reports that it was tom-tomed from morning 8 A.M. that the sale would beheld at the motor stand. The appellant's second allegation is therefore false. (E) p139 (G1)

3. The appellant is indebted to Bhagavantha Rao. The latter therefore filed a suit against the former and got the property attached in satisfaction of his debts through a civil Court. The attached property included S.No.30 of Harpanahally, and which was Hypothecated to State Loan. So when this land was brought to sale on 20.3.31, Bhagavantha Rao purchased it under keen competition. It is therefore evident that Bhaganvantha Rao is no underling of the Village Munsif. The allegation is therefore not credible. The answer filed in Hospet Munsif's Court has not been received and this application was sent to the Collector with this office D.Dis.C.No.3425/31, dated 1.8.31 (vide Collector's N.Ref.C.3712, dated 30.7.31). Vide cross at p121 of C (I) pp7-8 of (H)

4. This allegation is baseless. This is not a case in which any postponement of collection of loans instalment had to be considered. The grantee had deliberately misappropriated the loan and the Tahsildar had therefore ordered summary recovery in this case. Please see Tahsildar's report C.No.1145, dated 1.8.30 filed in Taluk D.Dis.2315, dated 28.12.31. This was in Fasli 133 9 when no post ponement of collection was ever ordered or considered. The arrear therefore related to ~~1338~~ 1339 fasli and not to 1340 fasli. The appellant has had ample opportunity to pay up the arrear and the present petition appears to be the outcome of wilful and obstructive tactics to gain time. pp61-65 of (G1)

5. This allegation is false. The district Munsif was distinctly informed of the facts.in Tahsildar's letter dated 11.6.1930. Please see Taluk D.Dis.C.No.2315, dated 28.12.31. pp53-54 of (G1)

6. The amount involved in this case is not trifling, it being Rs.210.6.6 and an attempt was also made to distrain the

moveables vide para (6) of Tahsildar's report C.No.620/32 dated 1.5.32 enclosed.

7. The notice No.4 under section 25 of the Revenue Recovery Act II of 1864 dated 13.9.30 clearly notes "Rs.176.4. plus వడ్డి " (Interest). The amount of interest as ascertained from the Treasury Deputy Collector was therefore included in No.5 notice under section 27 of the Act and in the sale notice under section (35) of the Act. In as much as the attachment notice No.4 distinctly says that the amount to be paid was "Rs.176.4.0 plus వడ్డి " the inclusion of interest amount in the No.5 notice and sale notice bringing the amount to Rs.210.3.3, is therefore not an erroneous inclusion of the amount in these notices as contemplated in C.Collector's Standing Order.No.2 of 1920 to warrant the cancellation of the sale. The records noted below are enclosed.

1. Taluk D.Dis.2315, dated 28.10.31
2. Sub Collector's L.Dis.2125, dated [illegible]
3. Sub Collector's L.Dis.C.No.1845, dated 23.5.31.
4. Sub Collector's L.Dis.C.No.2291/30 dated 2.2.30.
5. Collector's M.Ref.C.No.1871, dated 13.4.32 with its enclosure.

8. The balance of purchase money was paid on 20.4.31 and the sale was held on 20.3.31. It was therefore collected in time.

By Order.

Head Clerk.
18/5/32

N.D.18/5.

C.F. 32

Revenue / DEPARTMENT.

In reply, please quote number, date and short title *

Received.... Registered....

From (Name) Mrs J. Sivagini Iyer Avl
(Designation) Sub-Collector

Post Box..... (Station) Harpanahalli

To The

Sub-Collector of
Hospet.

Ref No. 620/32, dated 5-5-1932

Sir,

Advances - Loans - Harpanahalli Taluk
Harpanahalli Town - Muthagi Venkobaiah
Land sale - Cancellation - Appeal.

Enclosures
(Misc 2315/31
sent by Asst Supt)

Spare Copies

Your ref:. Misc 1982/3 dated 25-4-32

—

Pp 141-142 of G.I. I submitted a report in detail dated 9-5-31 when submitting the sale records for confirmation and again another report on the objections put forward in the appeal to the Collector. The allegations were found false and frivolous and the appeal was dismissed by the Collector. I submit the following reply for the allegations in the present appeal:-

1. There is no rule that land sales should not be held on public Holidays. Generally such days are convenient for holding land sales as the ryots have no work on that day and they can attend sales without any difficulty.

2. The allegation is false. It was not so notified in the sale notice. The Revenue Inspector who conducted the sale has reported that the sale was proclaimed to be held at the motor stand near Taluk Office, the place where sales ~~are~~ are usually held and that it was conducted at the

the proclaimed place. This point has already been dealt with. Please see my report dated 12.5.31.

3. There is no evidence ~~on record~~ that Bhagavanta Rao is an underling of the Reddi of Hampanahalli. This Bhagavanta Rao got this land, Rs. 30 mortgaged to Government for loan, attached by the Civil Court along with other property of the defaulter for the debt due to him. Fearing that the land will be sold away to others, he bid at the sale to safe guard his interest but he did not bid at the instigation of the village Reddi.

4. The allegation is false. The arrears relate to Fasli 1339. This is a case of Summary recovery, Suspension of instalment for Fasli 1340 was made in some deserving cases. In this case, the first sale was commenced in March 1930 In order to gain time, the appellant put in several objection petitions to cancel the sale. Therefore his case was not considered.

5. The allegation is untrue. A reference was made to the District Hunting Hospet on 12.6.30. Please see pages 53 ~~54~~ of this office DDis C 2315/31 A3 dated 28.12.31. The final sale was held on 20.3.:

6. The appalent is a litigant and always absenting himself + ie place during last season. Yet the Revenue Inspector managed to obtain the movables on 23.9.30. At the request of the appellant ~~that land was brought to sale~~ that the amount might be received from land sales, as he had already brought to ~~that~~ the value of the movables was trifling when sale, and compared with the arrears the movables were released (vide his petition and orders there on dated 3-10-30 - page 74). The movables attached were

were valued only Rs 33/- against arrears of Rs 216/-. He is a habitual defaulter to Government dues and a dangerous litigant as reported by my predecessor.

4. It was noted in the Demand notice No 4 that the arrears due was Rs 176-4-0 + Interest. After obtaining necessary information from the Treasury Deputy Collector the correct amount of interest, the interest was added in the DNOs 5 and 7 notices. There was also the word 'Interest' added to include further interest up to the date of adjustment after the sale is confirmed. This is no mistake. As the petitioner was putting forward all sorts of frivolous objections for the cancellation of sale, thus causing delay the word interest was also added.

8. The sale was held on 20.3.31 and the initial deposit was credited on 24.3.31 and the balance was credited on 20.4.31.

This appellant had no mind to pay his dues first when the sale was held on 18.3.30 and the sale now confirmed was held on 20.3.31. He had time of one year to pay his dues. He intentionally evaded payment and put in frivolous petitions to gain time. He deserves no consideration. This office DPis C 2315/31 A3 dated 28.12.31 containing 216 pages is enclosed herewith.

2.5.32

Asst Collector

List of records to be sent as enclosures to Collector's report Ref.C.No. 1874/32 dated 30-5-32.

1. Taluk D.Dis. 2315 dated 28-12-31. (G)
2. Sub-Collector's L.Dis. 3425 dated 1-9-31. (I)
3. Sub-Collector's L.Dis dated 23-5-31. (J)
4. Sub-Collector's L.Dis.2294 dated 2-9-30. (L)
5. Collector's D.Dis. 3719 dated 10-9-31. (H)
6. Tahsildar's report C.No. 620 dated 4-5-32. — 3 pages. MN 85 5/1
7. Appeal petition with all its enclosures. MN 1-28 ante
8. Copy of Sub-Collector's remarks. (L Dis e no 1982/32 e 3 pages) 17-5-32

A.S.N./30-5.

Acknowledged.
Sd/- V.K.
Senior Assistant.
30.5.32

To the Dr. of Malabar

Dept. 1.6.

41

Draft for approval

Addressee - Asst Commr
Harpanahalli taluk
Harpanahalli town
Muttiji Venkobba Rao
S.No 20 - Sale - Cancellation
Appeals - Rejected.

Mfl-30 of 7.7355 }
p27 of Regd dt 4-4-32 } Q.
p29 of 7 3008 Q to Govt
mfg

Rec - Mar 17/18.6.32

The petr is informed that the Board has no jurisdiction in the matter. The petn is rejected

KC 6.8.2

To the petr with Govt's answer (p.7 of 6.) 18.6.32 154 116m
(Muttiji Venkobba Rao
gois street, Harpanahalli
Bellary dt.)

Issue

copy to the Collr of Bellary with records as per list (at p39 of to be copied) as corrected

Dft

Notes

R. F. XXII-A-19--80,004-3-2-31 (6)

Subject.

NUMBER.

(S)
LRd
& (Sett)
thro A

Dwarees - Loans - (Bellary) - Harpanahalli taluk - Harpanahalli to. Nuttigi Venkoba Rao - land sale cancellation - petition.

READ AGAIN B. P. No. _____, dated _____ 193

" " " _____, " _____ 193

READ ALSO :—

Register No. Mfl-30f From the 7. 7355. , No. _____, dated _____ 193

p5 of. 7 297. } &
p13 of. 7.644.

" " " _____, _____, " _____ 193

" " _____, " " _____ " " _____, " _____ 193

RESOLUTION. Refer No. 7355/31-1, dated _____ 193

Forwarded to the Collector of Bellary for submission of the connected records with remarks on the allegations in the petition which are not clearly dealt with in the records.

MD
2.2.32
KV
2.2.32

re Collr. of Bellary with a petition and enclosures in original to be returned.

Note,

The appeal is time. It is non statutory. & may be entertained under the Board's general powers of revision. As it contains allegations not dealt

Please see note below.

with in the order appeale against (at p.7 e.f.) it may be referred to the Coll. remarks.

1-2-32

Note by A. Section

The petition is defective in following respects :-

(1) It has not been stamped with Court fee labels of the value of Rs 2-0-0. vide Board's petition rules - Rule XI (1) and the notes and orders at (H)

p.1068 of B.S.G. vol IV

(2) The petitioner has not submitted an authenticated and stamped copy of the order of the R.B.G in the matter. This is against Rule II of the Board's petition rules and also the orders at p.2 of (H).

p.1067 of B.S.G. vol IV.

The above defects may be got rectified before taking further action. For orders.

4-2-32

2/32

IA

P.C. to the pet.

8-2-32

6-2-32

Fr. 1295 - p 21 cf.
Fr. 1796. - p. 25 cf.

S
AS (Sett)
our A.

To asst secy
Stamp
The defects noticed in page 2 ante have been rectified. The petn may now be referred to the Collr for remarks as suggested in pp 1 & 2 ante. Draft order below.
2.4.32

1.4.32 S.

2.4.32

3.4.32.

S
AS (Sett)
Fin A/ see 9.6.32

p 27 cf. [Joined as Ref Fr. 2355/31-32] 4-43
p 29 cf. Fr. 3008

To asst secy

Please see appeal petn at pp 1-3 cf. against the Collr's order at p. 7 cf. [ijl at (H)].

2/ The facts of the case are briefly as follows —

The petr was granted two loans (Agl. 19/30 & 192 & p 1 cf. of 16/37) amounting to Rs 450

p. 11 of (H)

(1)

on the security of S.no 30.
As he defaulted payment
summary recovery was
ordered & the land was
brought to sale on 18-3-30. p 30 of (G)
As the bid amount was
low the sale was cancelled
by the R.D.O. In the resale p 67 abd
held on ~~20-3-31~~ 20-3-31 it was Rs 120+124 as
purchased for Rs 355/- by the same
man (Bhagavantha Rao). who
bid at the first sale ~~for~~
~~Rs 355~~ & the R.D.O confirm
it in his name on 24-5-31. p 119 abd
The petr now requests that
this sale may be cancelled. Mr 1-3 of
The several allegations
in his petn are ~~fully~~
dealt with in the R.D.O's report
at pp 31-33 & the Tahsr's report
at pp 35-37 R. of ~~It will be seen~~
~~therefrom that the petr has~~

D
.32

The Bd has no jurisdiction in the matter. The peti may be advised accordingly.

Sm. 10/6/32

no appeal lies: the petition may be rejected.

A.H.M 10.6.32

Vcent 11-6-32

P.T.O

In the appeal petn the petn refers to two B.P.s, namely B.P. 1474/29.11.20 (C) and B.P. 32/5-3.23 (D). These B.P.s were never publ for general information. The Circumstances subsisting that I saw in the Rev. Dept helped him to the petn. However no action seems called for.

para 6 & 7, p-1 c.f.

This is for information

I agree: we can't do anything in any case.

10.6.32

SECY. 11 JUN 1932

A.K.M. 10.6.32.

Ref. 11.6.32

11.6.32

AS (Sett)

Draft subd.

11/6/32

11.6.32.

Misc. 1789 dated 13.6.32.

7 Seetu

20 JUN 1932

List of Records.

1. Taluk D.Dis. 2315 dated 28-12-31
2. Sub Collector's L.Dis. 3425 dated 1-9-31
3. Sub Collector's L.Dis. 1845 dated 23-5-31
4. Sub Collector's L.Dis. 2294 dated 2-9-30
5. Collector's D.Dis. 3719 dated 10-9-31

MMKS KV
136

Acknowledged
Rs 17.6
For collector

To
The Board
L R & S
Madras

17632